

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 4 and 6 through 15 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are intended to broaden the scope thereof and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Seo, et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,688). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Seo discloses a technique for changing a requantization scale by a slice unit or by a block unit. Concretely, a step size of a requantization is obtained by calculation formulas described in equations 1 to 4 in column 5. *Seo* counts a number of macro blocks and calculate a step size of the requantization based on the counted number of macro blocks (Fig. 7, Column 7-8). However, *Seo* fails to teach or suggest the following features:

“determining a level of importance of each of the macroblocks; and determining a requantization scale based on the level of importance” (Claim 8);

“detecting a noticed region in each of the plurality of pictures” (Claim 9);

“detecting an edge in each of the plurality of slices” (Claim 10);

“the level of importance is determined according to a position of each of the plurality of slices” (Claim 11); and

“the level of importance is determined according to a combination of the detected result of the noticed region and a position of each of the plurality of slices” (Claim 12).

Claims 2-4 and Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Satoh, et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,157). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Satoh discloses a system for converting bit stream data to compressed data in conformity with MPEG2 standard. *Satoh* decodes a difference in DC component between the macroblocks (column 23), Lines 13-16). However, *Satoh* fails to teach or suggest the features:

“determining a requantization scale so as to correspond to the obtained DC-component difference value” (Claims 2 and 4).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 2, 2005

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS:djq